

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 09/19/2006

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/810,518	03/26/2004	Thomas H. Barrows	010414-9012	1213
23510 7	590 09/19/2006		EXAM	INER
MICHAEL BEST & FRIEDRICH, LLP			WARE, DEBORAH K	
ONE SOUTH PINCKNEY STREET P O BOX 1806			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MADISON, WI 53701			1651	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/810,518	BARROWS ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Deborah K. Ware	1651				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status		•				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 5/25/6	76.					
· ·	action is non-final.					
·=						
closed in accordance with the practice under E	·					
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>32-50</u> is/are pending in the application						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		·				
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) 32-50 are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner	·.					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce	epted or b) \square objected to by the $f I$	Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti	on is required if the drawing(s) is ob	ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		ı				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 LLS C & 110(a)	a-(d) or (f)				
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	priority drider 33 0.3.0. § 119(a)	-(u) or (i).				
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents	have been received					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	• •					
application from the International Bureau	•	d in this National Stage				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	, , , ,	d.				
	,	-				
•						
	•					
Attachment(s)		·				
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
2)	5) Notice of Informal P					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:					

Restriction

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Claims 32-47, drawn to a graft having a binding site moiety which is a peptide, classified in class 435, subclass 174.
- II. Claim 48, drawn to a graft having no binding site moiety, classified in class 424, subclass 78.06.
- III. Claims 49-50, drawn to a method of inducing hair to grow, classified in class 606, subclass 154.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

The inventions are distinct, each from the other since the graft of Group I and II do not require the same components for their function and hence may have a different function, wherein the claims of Group II can be capable of use for skin grafting, for example. Hence the two products are different and distinct one from the other as indicated by their classification, which further demonstrates their two way distinctness. Also the products are distinct from the method since the method requires the growth of hair using different components than those required of Group I or II. Therefore, there is one way distinctness which exists between the product claims of Groups I and II versus the method Group III.

Application/Control Number: 10/810,518

Art Unit: 1651

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Deborah K. Ware whose telephone number is 571-272-0924. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mike Wityshyn can be reached on 571-272-0926. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DEBORALK WARE PATENT EXAMINER Deborah K. Ware September 16, 2006